

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

1984

Sex Differences, Intimacy, and Attractiveness in Reported Self-Disclosure: Same-Sex Dyads vs Opposite-Sex Dyads

Edmund Forst Jr.

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Speech Communication](#) at Eastern Illinois University.
[Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Forst, Edmund Jr., "Sex Differences, Intimacy, and Attractiveness in Reported Self-Disclosure: Same-Sex Dyads vs Opposite-Sex Dyads" (1984). *Masters Theses*. 2835.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2835>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Aug 8, 1984

Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

SEX DIFFERENCES, INTIMACY, AND ATTRACTIVENESS
IN REPORTED SELF-DISCLOSURE:
SAME-SEX DYADS VS OPPOSITE-SEX DYADS
(TITLE)

BY

Edmund Forst Jr.

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS in Speech Communication
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1984
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

8/7/84
DATE

ADVISER

8/8/84
DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

COMMITTEE MEMBER

8/7/84
DATE

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

SEX DIFFERENCES, INTIMACY, AND ATTRACTIVENESS
IN REPORTED SELF-DISCLOSURE:
SAME-SEX DYADS VS OPPOSITE-SEX DYADS

by

Edmund Forst Jr.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Speech Communication

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Charleston, Illinois

1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would to like to thank those individuals who made made the completion of this study possible. Without their help, understanding, and support, the success of the study would have been minimal.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Douglas G. Bock, Chairman of my Committee and advisor throughout my graduate studies. His availability whenever problems occurred in the study allowed me to gain confidence in my work. Further, Dr. Bock's continual encouragement gave me motivation when there seemed to be none.

I would like to thank Dr. Terry Perkins, also present in my Committee , for his advice and ideas on ways in which to improve the study. His friendship also gave me the courage and confidence to complete my graduate studies.

To my good friend, Dr. Frank E. Parcells, I want to express my sincerest thanks. Without his encouragement and advice in personal matters which could have had an affect on my study, the thesis would never have been completed.

Finally, I want to thank my father, Edmund Forst Sr., for his deep faith and confidence in my abilities. His sincere encouragement and loyalty in my beliefs has instilled within me enough courage to stand up for what I believe, no matter what the consequences result in.

Edmund C. Forst Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	1
Definition of Self-Disclosure	1
Benefits and Risks of Self-Disclosure	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Framework of Study.....	6
Review of Literature.....	7
Gender (Same-sex/opposite-sex).....	7
Attractiveness	9
Intimacy.....	12
II. METHODOLOGY	14
Research Design	14
Operational Definitions	14
Subjects	15
Procedure	16
Statistical Treatment of the Data	17
III. RESULTS.....	19
Table 1: Factorial Analysis of Variance....	21
Table 2: Significant Interaction between Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness.....	24
Table 3: Statistical Significance between Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness.....	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
Table 4: Statistical Significance of the Variable Gender(#1).....	31
IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION.....	32
Conclusions and Explanations.....	32
Discussion.....	36
Implications of Study.....	38
Limitations of Study.....	39
Future Research.....	40
NOTES.....	42
APPENDICES.....	53
Appendix A: Operational Definitions for Intimacy	54
Appendix B: Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. 2x3x2x2 Factorial Analysis of Variance	21
2. Significant Interaction between Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness	24
3. Statistical Significance between Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness	27
4. Statistical Significance of the Variable Gender ¹ ...	31

ABSTRACT

Sex Differences, Intimacy, and Attractiveness in Reported Self-Disclosure: Same-sex dyads vs Opposite-sex dyads

by

Edmund Forst Jr, Master of Arts

Eastern Illinois University, 1984

Major Professor: Dr. Douglas G. Bock

Department: Speech Communication

This study empirically examined the effects of sex (gender), intimacy, and attractiveness on reported self-disclosure. The results were supportive of the attractiveness, intimacy, and gender of the self-disclosee variables in their relationship to self-disclosure. Results failed to support hypotheses involving the gender of the self-discloser variable.

The independent variables used in the study were: (1) Gender¹ of the self-discloser (male-female), (2) Intimacy (intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger), (3) Gender² of the self-disclosee (male-female), and physical attractiveness (Attractive or Unattractive). The dependent variable used was the amount of perceived self-disclosure. A 2x3x2x2 analysis of variance used to test each hypothesis showed significant interaction between Intimacy, Gender², and Attractiveness. In addition, the analysis indicated a significant main effect for the independent variable Gender¹.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Research involving self-disclosure in dyads (both self-discloser and self-disclosee) has produced inconsistent results. Several studies have measured self-disclosure differences between males and females in interpersonal relationships. For example, Chelune reports that females disclose more than men while, Pearson states that males tend to disclose more than females.¹ However, few studies have examined amounts of self-disclosure between same-sex and opposite-sex dyads in interpersonal relationships.² Since communication between same-sex and opposite-sex dyads does take place frequently in society,³ an examination of same-sex and opposite-sex self-disclosure patterns is necessary. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the effects of perceived self-disclosure involving same-sex and opposite-sex dyads in interpersonal communication.

Definition of Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure occurs when Person A tells Person B something about him or herself.⁴ Jourard's argues that this communication must be personal information not readily available from some other source.⁵ According to Wilmot, every communication act is self-revealing in a transactional

perspective.⁶ However, the communicative act must be made voluntarily and the content must concern the self in order to be considered self-disclosure.⁷

The significance of self-disclosure arises from a great fascination with the experiences of others. Behavior is visible, experience is not. Jourard believes that society wants to know what a person is saying by his/her behaviors. In this manner, people can explain the behavior of others. A better understanding of thoughts, ideas, and actions in society will result. Communication between individuals will become more productive once the thoughts, ideas, and actions of others in society are understood. The only way people can know what another person is experiencing is if s/he discloses his/her experiences to others.⁸

Self-disclosure is important in interpersonal communication. Studies indicate that interpersonal communication is virtually impossible if the individuals involved refuse to share themselves with others.⁹ Jourard states that self-disclosure is credited as the means by which man comes to an accurate perception of self and others.¹⁰ Thus, the study of variables which affect self-disclosure becomes necessary for a better understanding of behavior and communication in society. Understanding behaviors in society will allow individuals to communicate productively with each other.

Benefits and Risks of Self-Disclosure

Appropriate self-disclosure¹¹ has numerous benefits for the individual. Wheelless and Grotz discovered that appropriate self-disclosure leads to increased trust in the communication dyad. Marriages will normally have increased trust because of honest self-disclosures from both members of the communication dyad.¹²

Other studies have shown that appropriate self-disclosure results in increased liking, and often, loving.¹³ Similarly, Gilbert and Horenstein believe increased attraction can be gained through self-disclosure.¹⁴ Therefore, it seems logical that appropriate self-disclosure increases interpersonal communication.

According to Rosenfeld, appropriate self-disclosure promotes mental health in three ways. First, appropriate self-disclosure decreases self-alienation for the individual. Further, self-disclosure provides the means whereby an individual may gain greater consistency between self-concept and other's concept of him or herself. Finally, self-disclosure may increase mental health by leading to an enhanced self-concept. Consequently, the individual will experience a large number of important interpersonal variables such as self- acceptance, feelings of security, and a greater tolerance for a wider range of behaviors from others.¹⁵

Though self-disclosure seems essential to the development and maintenance of good interpersonal relationships, there are also potential risks involved in self-disclosing to others. Discussing interaction in the organizational setting, Fritz Steele states six overlapping causes of low disclosure: (1) disclosure might lead to negative evaluations, a loss of self-esteem and esteem from those to whom disclosures are made, (2) a decrease in satisfying relationships if the disclosures alienate or anger the other person, (3) a loss of control over a situation (for example, to disclose future plans might limit freedom of choice), (4) "hurt" for the other person, (5) the projection of a negative image and, (6) the Great Lie Theory, in which a presumed greater benefits would be gained through lie as opposed to a truthful disclosure.¹⁶

These risks often leads to avoidance of self-disclosure by individuals. Perry believes that individuals aren't likely to self-disclose in situations where risks are thought of being threatening or too great.¹⁷ As John Powell states:

Self-disclosure behavior may be seen as the product of two opposing forces, one operating to increase disclosure, the other operating to inhibit disclosure.¹⁸

Purpose of the Study

Several variables exist in almost all interpersonal relationships.¹⁹ However, research indicates that sex(male-female), intimacy (level of relationship: intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger), and attractiveness(unattractive or attractive) are the three most significant variables in determining amounts of self-disclosure in the communication dyad.²⁰ In order to understand the effects of self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships, the variables of sex, intimacy, and attractiveness need to be studied. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine the effects of sex(gender) intimacy, and attractiveness on reported self-disclosure.

Several questions can be raised concerning the effects of sex(gender), intimacy, and attractiveness on self-disclosure. When will individuals disclose their experiences to others? Who will they disclose them to? Males? Females? An intimate friend? Or will they disclose to only strangers? Further, will self-disclosers find their self-disclosees more or less attractive than individuals they refuse to disclose with?

This study attempted to measure perceived differences in the amount of self-disclosure between same-sex dyads(male-male, female-female) and opposite-sex dyads(male-female). Further, a point scale(from 1 to 100)

was employed to measure the self-discloser's attractiveness to the self-disclosee. Three conditions of the independent variable Intimacy were used to measure self-disclosure: intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger.

Framework of Study

Since the project investigated perceived amounts of self-disclosure, Jourard's 'dyadic effect' theory was used as a framework of study. Though many variables are involved in how much a person will disclose to another (subject matter, characteristics of the person, and the setting in which disclosure is to take place), Jourard states the most important determiner of self-disclosure appears to be "the willingness of the audience to disclose himself to the subject to the same extent that he expects the subject to confide his experience."²¹ The gender and attractiveness of the audience is significant in determining the extent of self-disclosure. Further, the level of intimacy in interpersonal relationships is important in contributing to the "willingness of the audience" to self-disclose.²² Combined with the social penetration theory which states that "the development of interpersonal relationships includes such reciprocal behaviors as exchange of information (self-disclosure), exchange of positive and negative effect, and mutual activities", ²³ the foundation of the study has been laid. The variables of gender,

attractiveness, and intimacy were studied in reference to Jourard's 'dyadic effect' and the social penetration theory.

Review of Literature

Gender (Same-sex/ Opposite-sex)

Research concerning sex differences in self-disclosure has produced inconsistent results. According to Baird, studies have failed to support typical male and female stereotypes, reporting no difference between male and female disclosure patterns.²⁴ Dimond and Mintz reported no statistical significant difference in self-disclosure between men and women in communication involving high-school students.²⁵ Further, two studies have discovered that no disclosure difference occurred in male and female adults.²⁶

Conversely, Perry states that members of the same-sex will self-disclose more than they will to members of the opposite-sex.²⁷ Other studies indicate that there are significant differences between male and female self-disclosure patterns, with females disclosing and receiving more self-disclosure than males.²⁸

The latter studies were based, in part, on R.H. Conviser's theory of interpersonal trust. Conviser states that similarity is the key factor in the amount of trust within any relationship.²⁹ Adding from Jourard's theory

that people tend to disclose more to people who resemble them in various ways than to people who are different from them,³⁰ the logic for these results seems well founded.

There are two reasons for the inconsistent results involving sex differences in self-disclosure: (1) the categories and variables have not been defined properly and, (2) problems with consistent measurement of variables.

Previous research has demonstrated that variables in self-disclosure studies have not been properly defined. In Perry's study, the researcher defined categories of friend, acquaintance, and sex for participants. As noted by the researcher in the discussion section, results of the study may have been skewed due to improper definitions.³¹ Further, other studies report that improper definitions of variables have caused inconsistent results in past studies.³² Therefore, a proper definition of categories and variables is needed to examine reported amounts of self-disclosure.

Though studies have tried to measure sex differences in self-disclosure with regard to a target person,³³ the recent literature on self-disclosure has not provided evidence of consistent relationships between self-disclosure and independent variables.³⁴ Vondracek and Marshall believe that demonstrating such a relationship would aid self-disclosure research in two ways: (1) the relationship would be a significant step toward the definitional

clarification of self-disclosure and, (2) the relationship would represent a first step in the establishment of construct validity for a measure of self-disclosure.³⁵

Through a proper definition of consistent variables, the four following hypotheses for Gender were developed for this study:

H : Females will self-disclose more than men.

1

H : Females will receive more self-disclosure than men.

2

H : Members of the same-sex will self-disclose more than
3
members of the opposite-sex.

H : Members of the same-sex will receive more self-disclosure
4
than members of the opposite-sex.

Attractiveness

Evidence concerning the relationship between self-disclosure and physical attractiveness has been contradictory. Some investigators have failed to find a linear relationship between intimate disclosure and increased attraction for the revealer,³⁶ while one study reported intimate disclosure leading to decreased liking.³⁷

Other studies have demonstrated the importance of physical attractiveness to self-disclosure.³⁸ Perry states that physically attractive persons are thought to possess more desirable personality traits.³⁹ Since highly attractive persons have a higher reinforcement level for

disclosers,⁴⁰ a person might be expected to disclose more to an attractive person than to an unattractive person.⁴¹

Further, Chaikin and Derlega suggests that "persons who voluntarily disclose intimate information about themselves may infer that they like the target person because of these revelations."⁴² Drawing upon Bem's self-perception theory,⁴³ Chaikin and Derlega state that not only may a person disclose to whom he likes, this person may find receivers of self-disclosure physically attractive.⁴⁴

In contrast to the inconsistent results of sex differences on self-disclosure, the controversy over attractiveness and self-disclosure has arisen because: (1) the level of intimate self-disclosure has been manipulated and, (2) the definition of attractiveness has been too strictly defined. In their study, Archer, Berg, and Runge manipulated the intimacy of the perceiver's own disclosure, finding no effects on attraction for target persons.⁴⁵ For the experiment, the investigators assigned subject's level of intimacy. Consequently, participants were given an explanation of their purpose in the study (the requirements of the research design). Since research has stated that knowing the requirements of the research design beforehand may create invalid results,⁴⁶ the experiment's results may have been skewed.

Previous studies have also demonstrated that the variable of attractiveness has been defined too narrowly.⁴⁷ In a field experiment, Harrell provided traits whereby students could measure attractiveness for "female

confederates."⁴⁸ Perry believes that results from studies that define attractiveness may be biased and inappropriate for experiment research.⁴⁹

This study allowed each subject participating to define the variable of attractiveness. Subjects determined if they perceived a person to be attractive or unattractive. Adams and Crossman believe that by the time children reach six years of age, they have been indoctrinated as to what is considered to be attractive.⁵⁰ Thus, it becomes logical that participates can validly determine attractiveness on their own.

Allowing for the subject's definition of attractiveness, the four following hypotheses for attractiveness and gender were tested:

H : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to an
5
attractive person than to an unattractive person.

H : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to a
6
same-sex attractive person than to a same-sex unattractive person.

H : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to a
7
opposite-sex attractive person than to a opposite-sex unattractive person.

H : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to a
8
same-sex attractive person than to a opposite-sex unattractive person.

Intimacy

The importance of intimacy in self-disclosure has been shown in several studies.⁵¹ Runge and Archer discovered that intimacy is a significant factor in "private" and "public" self-disclosures.⁵² Murdoch, Chenowith, and Rissman found that there was more disclosures by subjects in high intimacy conditions than in low intimacy conditions.⁵³

Self-disclosure tends to be reciprocal and to become more intimate as relationships proceed over time. Gabelein reports that friends tend to disclose more and strangers least.⁵⁴ Therefore, it would seem logical that intimate friends would disclose more than acquaintances, and strangers.

Research has stated that intimacy is correlated with both gender and attractiveness in determining amounts of perceived self-disclosure.⁵⁵ Perry states that the intimacy of self-disclosure is significantly greater for an attractive person than for an unattractive person.⁵⁶ Further, Chelune has reported that the level of intimacy in interpersonal relationships can determine self-disclosure patterns in males and females.⁵⁷ However, research indicates that gender and attractiveness are more significant than intimacy in determining amounts of perceived self-disclosure.⁵⁸

The following two hypotheses were formulated to examine the effect of intimacy in amounts of perceived self-disclosure:

H₉ : Members of intimate friendships will disclose more than acquaintances, or strangers.

H₁₀ : Members of acquaintances will disclose more than strangers.

The correlation between intimacy, gender, and attractiveness creates the following three hypotheses:

H₁₁ : Members of the same-sex will self-disclose more than members of the opposite-sex in intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers.

H₁₂ : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to an attractive person than to an unattractive person in three levels of relationships: intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers.

H₁₃ : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to an attractive intimate friend than to attractive acquaintance, and stranger.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of sex, intimacy, and attractiveness on reported self-disclosure.

The dependent variables were the amount of perceived self-disclosure scores, with self-disclosure being defined as "the act of revealing personal information not readily available from some other source." The independent variables included gender¹ of the self-discloser (male, female), intimacy of the relationship (intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger), gender² of the discloser (male or female), and attractiveness of the self-discloser (attractive or unattractive). Variables of intimacy, gender¹, gender² were defined by the researcher, while attractiveness was defined by each participant. All categories of the Intimacy variable were designed by the researcher. No description of the variables were given to the subjects.

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions were employed in

the study:

Self-Disclosure: the act of revealing personal information not readily available from some other source.

Sex: same-sex or opposite-sex

Variables :

1

Gender : Gender of the self-discloser(male or female)

2

Gender : Gender of the self-disclosee(male or female)

Attractiveness: Perception of the self-disclosee
(attractive or unattractive)

Intimacy: Type of relationship in communication dyad.
(Intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger)

Categories of the Variable Intimacy:

Intimate friend: Very close association, contact, or familiarity; a warm friendship

Acquaintance: a person attached to another by respect or affection

Stranger: a person you have just met or recently met

59

Subjects

The subjects were undergraduate students enrolled in the basic speech communication course at Eastern Illinois University. The speech course is offered to students on a semester basis and required for every student, not only communication majors. Therefore, the study was a representative sample of the university.

The students, ages ranging from 19 to 21 years, were chosen from six different sections (with four teachers distributing the test).

Procedure

Each student received Jourard's 25-item Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. Split-half reliability of the questionnaire has been demonstrated with a separate American sample; odd-even r 's for each "target" were all .90 or higher.⁶⁰ Also, the questionnaire method had been previously found to have validity. Two additional studies with a much abbreviated questionnaires showed that the instrument had some measure of predictive validity.⁶¹

Students also received an attractiveness scale that was located at the bottom of the questionnaire. The scale listed numbers from 1 to 100. Coefficients for the attractiveness scale were found to have split-half reliability and some measure of predictive validity.⁶²

The instructions were written on the questionnaire and not reviewed by the teacher. The only instruction given to the students was the target-person they disclosed to (One section disclosed to a male stranger, another section disclosed to a female stranger, etc.) Students listed their gender and either "1" (high disclosure) or "0" (low

disclosure) for each self-disclosure question. Also, students circled a number on the attractiveness scale from 1 to 100, depending on the amount of perceived attractiveness toward the self-disclosee. Numbers 1 to 50 on the scale signified low attractive self-disclosees while, numbers 51-100 represented high attractive self-disclosees.

The questionnaire took approximately fifteen minutes to complete. After each student finished the test, questionnaires were collected and the students thanked.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

A 2x3x2x2 factorial analysis of variance was employed in measuring the results. This statistical method allowed an analysis of the interactive effects of the four independent variables on the the dependent variable.⁶³

The dependent variable was the amount of perceived self-disclosure scores. Independent variables included gender(of the self-discloser), intimacy(of the self-disclosure relationship: intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger), acquaintance(gender of the self-disclosee) and attractiveness(of the self-disclosee). Gender and acquaintance variables were represented by a "0" (male) or "1" (female) while, the intimacy variable was signified by a "1" (intimate friend), "2" (acquaintance), or "3" (stranger). The attractiveness variable was determined by

the researcher and represented by a "0" or "1" ("0" signifying low attraction (1-50 on the scale), "1" signifying high attraction (51-100 on the scale), "1" signifying high attraction (51-100 on the scale)).

The level of significance for interaction was set at .05, which is generally accepted in the social sciences.⁶⁴ statistical significance was found in the interaction of the three independent variables Intimacy, Acquaintance, and Attractiveness, t-tests were run on the specific means to determine significance.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Table 1 : Factorial Analysis of Variance

Listed in Table 1 are results from the analysis of variance. A significant statistical interaction was discovered between Intimacy, Gender² (Self-disclosee), and Attractiveness ($p > .05$). Over half of the variance (sixty percent) was accounted for in the entire study.

Table 2: Specific Means

Table 2 shows the specific means of the interaction between intimacy, Gender², and attractiveness. The variables of Intimacy and Attractiveness were significant ($p > .05$) and combined to account for more than half the variance (fifty-one percent). However, because of significant statistical interaction, both the intimacy and attractiveness variables are not statistically significant.

Table 3: Statistical Significance of Means

In Table 3, the statistical significance of each specific mean is given. The table indicates that there is more perceived self-disclosure to intimate friends (opposite and same-sex) than to both acquaintances (opposite and same-sex) and strangers (opposite and same-sex). However, the attractive female stranger received higher levels of perceived self-disclosure than acquaintances (male-female) and strangers (male-female). Further, attractive (male-female) disclosees received larger amounts of perceived self-disclosure than unattractive disclosees. Thus, attractiveness would appear to be a significant determiner of self-disclosure.

Table 4: The variable Gender¹

Table 4 lists the specific means of the variable gender¹. The variable Gender¹ was found to be statistically significant ($p > .05$). Therefore, the table shows that females tend to disclose more than males. However, Gender¹ accounted for only 6% of the variance in the study.

Table 1
2x3x2x2 Factorial Analysis of Variance
(130 responses)

Source of Variation	DF	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
¹ Gender	1	112.587	6.18	0.014
Intimacy	2	1089.775	29.93	0.000
² Gender	1	12.840	0.71	0.403
Attractiveness	1	374.319	20.56	0.000
¹ Gender-Intimacy	2	6.025	0.17	0.848
¹ ² Gender-Gender	1	8.057	0.44	0.507
Intimacy-Gender ²	2	701.891	19.27	0.000
¹ Gender- -Attractiveness	1	7.137	0.39	0.527

Table 1 Continued
2x3x2x2 Factorial Analysis of Variance
(130 responses)

Source of Variation	DF	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Intimacy- Attractiveness	2	102.871	2.82	0.064
2 Gender - Attractiveness	1	128.345	7.05	0.009
1 Gender- Intimacy- 2 Gender	2	51.227	1.41	0.250
1 Gender- Intimacy- Attractiveness	2	30.239	0.83	0.439
1 Gender- 2 Gender - Attractiveness	1	33.521	1.84	0.178

Table 1 Continued
 2x3x2x2 Factorial Analysis of Variance
 (130 responses)

Source of Variation	DF	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Intimacy- Gender(2) Attractiveness	2	186.007	5.11	0.007
1 Gender- Intimacy- Gender(2) Attractiveness	1	71.435	3.92	0.050

Table 2
Significant Interaction
between
Intimacy, Gender (#2), and Attractiveness

Intimacy-

- 1- Intimate friend
- 2- Acquaintance
- 3- Stranger

Gender (#2)-

- 0- Male
- 1- Female

Attractiveness-

- 0- Unattractive
- 1- Attractive

Intimacy	Gender + ²	Attractiveness	Number*	Disclosure Scores**
1	0	0	4	16.25
1	0	1	20	20.30
1	1	0	6	10.00
1	1	1	15	17.40

Table 2 Continued
 Significant Interaction
 between
 Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness

Intimacy	Gender + ²	Attractiveness	Number*	Disclosure Scores**
2	0	0	6	11.17
2	0	1	13	12.69
2	1	0	6	11.50
2	1	1	15	12.20
3	0	0	18	7.94
3	0	1	3	5.67
3	1	0	4	4.00

* - Number of students participating

** - The means of self-disclosure scores

+ - The identity of self-disclosee

Table 2 Continued
 Significant Interaction
 between
 Intimacy, Gender (#2), and Attractiveness

Intimacy-

- 1- Intimate friend
- 2- Acquaintance
- 3- Strangers

Gender (#2) -

- 0- Male
- 1- Female

Attractiveness-

- 0- Unattractive
- 1- Attractive

Intimacy	Gender + 2	Attractiveness	Number*	Disclosure Scores**

3	1	1	20	15.95

* - Number of students participating

** - The means of self-disclosure scores

+ - The identity of self-disclosee

Table 3
Statistical Significance
between
Intimacy, Gender (#2), and Attractiveness

Combination of Variables	Significance of Means
<hr/>	
<hr/>	
Unattractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Unattractive Intimate friend-Female	10.00 *
Unattractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Unattractive Stranger-Male	7.94 *
Unattractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Unattractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Attractive Stranger-Male	5.67 *
Unattractive Intimate friend-Female	10.00
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Unattractive Acquaintance-Male	11.50
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Unattractive Acquaintance-Female	11.17
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30
Attractive Acquaintance-Male	12.69 *

* - Statistical Significance

2

(Note: Eta result was 0.599--Sixty percent of the variance in the study was accounted for.)

Table 3 Continued
Statistical Significance
between
Intimacy, Gender (#2), and Attractiveness

Combination of Variables		Significance of Means
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30	
Attractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50	*
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30	
Attractive Stranger-Male	5.67	*
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30	
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95	*
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40	
Attractive Acquaintance-Male	12.69	*
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40	
Attractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50	*
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40	
Attractive Stranger-Male	5.67	*
Attractive Acquaintance-Male	12.69	
Attractive Stranger-Male	5.67	*
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95	
Attractive Acquaintance-Male	12.69	*
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95	
Attractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50	*
Attractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50	
Attractive Stranger-Male	5.67	*
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95	
Attractive Stranger-Male	5.67	*

Table 3 Continued
 Statistical Significance
 between
 Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness

Combination of Variables	Significance of Means
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Unattractive Intimate friend-Female	10.00 *
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95
Unattractive Stranger-Male	7.94 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40
Unattractive Intimate friend-Female	10.00 *
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Unattractive Acquaintance-Male	11.17 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	16.25
Unattractive Stranger-Male	7.94 *
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95
Unattractive Intimate friend-Female	10.00 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40
Unattractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50 *
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95
Unattractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *

Table 3 Continued
 Statistical Significance
 between
 Intimacy, Gender(#2), and Attractiveness

Combination of Variables	Significance of Means
Attractive Acquaintance-Female	12.20
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30
Unattractive Acquaintance-Female	11.50 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Male	20.30
Unattractive Stranger-Female	4.00 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40
Unattractive Acquaintance-Male	11.17 *
Attractive Intimate friend-Female	17.40
Unattractive Stranger-Male	7.94 *
Attractive Acquaintance-Female	12.20
Unattractive Stranger-Male	7.94 *
Attractive Stranger-Female	15.95
Unattractive Acquaintance-Male	11.17 *

Table 4
 Statistical Significance
 of the Variable
 Gender (#1)

Gender ¹ +	Number **	Self-Disclosure Scores++

0 (Male)	58	12.59
1 (Female)	72	14.46 *

* - Statistical Significance

** - Number of students participating

+ - The identity of self-discloser

++ - The means of self-disclosure scores

(Note : F value result was 6.18-- Six percent of the variance
 in the study was accounted for by Gender.)

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Conclusions and Explanations

The observed results were supportive of the gender¹ hypothesis and interactions involving gender², intimacy, and attractiveness. The hypotheses concerning same-sex and opposite-sex dyads were not supported. Further, hypotheses involving main effects of gender², intimacy, and attractiveness failed to gain support.

H : Females will self-disclose more than males.
1

The first hypothesis was supported. Since there was statistical interaction between gender², intimacy, and attractiveness, the 1 gender variable was statistically significant. Gender¹ only accounted for six percent of the total variance in the study.

H : Females will receive more self-disclosure than males.
2

This hypothesis was not supported. Because of the interaction, gender² was not statistically significant. Further, gender² accounted for less than one percent of the total variance in the study.

H : Members of the same-sex will self-disclose more
3
than members of the opposite-sex.

The third hypothesis was not supported. The interaction between Gender¹ and gender² was not statistically

significant. Since Gender¹ is statistically significant, it would seem that gender² is the cause for the hypothesis failing to be supported. Thus, the gender of the self-disclosee is not a significant determiner of perceived amounts of self-disclosure.

H : Members of the same-sex will receive more self-disclosure
4
than members of the opposite-sex.

This hypothesis also was not supported because of gender².

H : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to an
5
attractive person than to an unattractive person.

Since the interaction between gender², intimacy, and attractiveness was statistically significant, the main effect of attractiveness was not statistically significant. However, results indicate that the attractiveness variable was significant. Though the fifth hypothesis was not supported, it would seem that attractiveness is a major determiner of self-disclosure.

H : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to a same-sex
6
attractive person than to a same-sex unattractive person.

This hypothesis was not supported. The interaction between Gender¹, gender², and attractiveness was not statistically significant.

H₇ : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to a opposite-sex attractive person than to a opposite-sex unattractive person.

Though attractiveness seems to have an affect on amounts of this hypothesis was not supported because of the same-sex and opposite-sex dyads. No statistical significance was found between Attractiveness, Gender¹, and Gender².

H₈ : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to a same-sex attractive person than to a opposite-sex unattractive person.

The eighth hypothesis was also not supported. The interaction between Gender¹, gender², and attractiveness accounted for only two percent of the variance in the entire study.

H₉ : Members of intimate friendships will disclose more than acquaintances, or strangers.

Because of statistical interaction between gender², intimacy, and attractiveness, this hypothesis was not supported. However, the main effect of intimacy was significant. Thus, intimacy would also seem to have an affect on perceived amounts of self-disclosure.

H₁₀ : Members of acquaintance will disclose more than strangers.

Though intimacy accounted for approximately 30% of the variance, the tenth hypothesis was not supported because of the statistical significant interaction.

H₁₁ : Members of the same-sex will self-disclose more members of the opposite-sex in intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers.

This hypothesis was not supported. There was no statistical significant difference in self-disclosure between same-sex and opposite-sex dyads in communication involving intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers.

H₁₂ : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to an attractive person than to an unattractive person in three types of relationships: intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers.

This hypothesis was supported because of the interaction between Intimacy, Acquaintance, and Attractiveness. However, the interaction between Intimacy and Attractiveness was not statistically significant. Thus, the reason for this support was not established.

H₁₃ : There will be more perceived self-disclosure to an attractive intimate friend than to attractive intimate friends, acquaintances and strangers.

The final hypothesis was also supported. The interaction between Intimacy and Attractiveness accounted for more than half the variance in the entire study. Again, because of the statistical significant interaction, the reason for the support was not established.

Discussion

The results of this study have several implications. There was no statistical significant difference in self-disclosure between same-sex dyads and opposite-sex dyads in communication involving intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers. Therefore, the results failed to support studies stating that there is more perceived self-disclosure between same-sex dyads than opposite-sex dyads.⁶⁵

Though statistical significance was not discovered for same-sex and opposite-sex dyads, there was statistical significance between intimacy(target person) and the self-disclosee's gender. Further, Intimacy accounted for approximately 30% percent of the variance in the study. This would indicate that both males and females will disclose more to intimate friends than to both acquaintances and strangers. Considering Conviser's interpersonal theory⁶⁶ and studies stating that friends tend to disclose more than strangers,⁶⁷ these results are logical.

Another point is that a high percentage(sixty) of the variance was accounted for in the study. Over half of this variance(fifty-one) was caused by the variables Intimacy and Attractiveness. Though this is an indication that intimacy (target person) may be a major factor in self-disclosure, no statement can be made about main effects (in intimacy) because of the significant interaction.

The idea of similarity causing increased self-disclosure within same-sex dyads as compared to opposite-sex dyads has been supported only slightly by the data. Applying similarity theories, there is enough similarity to cause more self-disclosure with intimate friends than acquaintances or strangers. However, there is not, as Perry indicated,⁶⁸ evidence that similarity in gender will lead to more self-disclosure.

Combined with intimacy, attractiveness seems to have an influential role on perceived self-disclosure. Results of the study indicates that an attractive person will receive more self-disclosure than an unattractive person. Further, the attractiveness variable appears to be more significant in determining amounts of self-disclosure than both gender and intimacy. For example, attractive female strangers received more perceived self-disclosure than attractive or unattractive female acquaintances and intimate friends. Consequently, the perceived attractiveness of an individual would seem to determine the amount of self-disclosure he or she will receive. The results would support studies stating that an attractive person will receive more self-disclosure because he or she possesses more desirable personality traits. Also, disclosers would seem to like the attractive person as evident by the higher self-disclosure scores. An attractive person has higher reinforcement level for

disclosers than an unattractive person.

The variable gender was found to have statistical significance ($p > .05$). The significance indicates that females will disclose more than males. Thus, the over-all evidence favoring females "disclosing" more than males has been supported in this study.⁶⁹

Implication of Study

The implications for this study can be found in education and communication. Since this paper is reporting that an increase in similarities with genders will not cause self-disclosure, educational teachers will have to change their communication philosophies. No longer can teachers instruct under the assumption that similarity in gender will lead to better communication through self-disclosure. Eventuallly, this will force teachers to focus on other techniques for gaining this needed similarity.

Results also indicate that problems in communication can be solved by getting more intimate in the communication dyad. Because both males and females disclose more to a perceived intimate friend, business employers could solve employee problems if they got closer to that person. Obviously, if that employer is perceived to be an intimate friend, employees will confide in him/her more. Therefore, employee disagreements and arguments could be decreased. In short, business employers and employees could develop better relationships 39 by applying these results.

This principle can apply in other areans of communication. For example, if a teacher can be perceived as an intimate friend, better relationships in the classroom will occur.

Relationships between men and women can be increased if both members got closer together. Though this may seem obvious on the surface, many relationships break up because one or both members no longer feel intimate and discontinue self-disclosure.

Attractiveness can be used to increase relationships through self-disclosure. Business employers who dress attractively will gain discover a higher rate of self-disclosure from employers. Attractive looking teachers will achieve more respect from their students through increase self-disclosure. Also, husbands and wives can gain more self-disclosure by dressing attractively for their spouses. Increased self-disclosure in these areas will lead to improved communication and relationships.

Limitations of Study

Two problems occurred in this study. First, only 130 students (primarily freshmen) were questioned. This is a problem because too many intervening variables were not considered in the test. For example, students may self-disclose more or less, depending on what school and part of the country they're from. Also, juniors and

seniors may tend to self-disclose more than freshmen and sophomores. Finally, differences in race, not gender, may account for self-disclosure scores.

The other problem concerns the attractiveness scale and Jourard's self-disclosure questionnaire. Other measuring instruments for attractiveness and self-disclosure may have higher validity than the tests employed in this study. If so, the results of this study may not be consistent with results of future studies.

Future Research

Future research should rectify these two flaws. A larger sample of juniors, seniors, and graduate students, from different universities, need to be tested. Race difference in self-disclosure should also be focused on.

Further, a search for better measuring instruments need to be conducted. Additional studies and testing of Jourard's 25-item Questionnaire and the attractiveness scale must be attempted. If more reliable instruments can be found for measuring attractiveness and self-disclosure, they should be employed.

Research on intimacy should be attempted. Even though the paper can not state that intimacy is a major factor in self-disclosure, this factor has been indicated through significance and high 41 percentage of variance. Reasons for

self-disclosure to both attractive and unattractive intimate friends, acquaintances, and strangers also needs to be tested. Also, reasons for the higher perceived disclosure to attractive female strangers compared to attractive female-male acquaintances and intimate friends need to be examined. If these reasons can be determined, society can better understand why self-disclosure, as part of communication, takes place.

NOTES

1

Gordon J. Chelune, "A Multidimensional Look At Sex and Target Differences in Disclosure," Psychological Reports, 39 (1976), pp. 259-263.; Judy C. Pearson, "Sex Roles and Self-Disclosure." Psychological Reports, 47 (1980), pp. 640.

2

John E. Baird, Jr., "Sex Differences In Group Communication: A Review of Relevant Research," Quarterly Journal Of Speech, 62 (April, 1976), p. 181.

3

Edmund C. Forst Jr., "Sex Differences in Self-Disclosure: Same-Sex Dyads Vs Opposite-Sex Dyads," Pilot Study. Submitted to Dr. Douglas G. Bock, Department Chairman of Speech-Communication, Eastern Illinois University, for SPC 5000, December 6, 1983. (Copies are available from the author, Communication Department, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Ill., 61920)

4

Lawrence B. Rosenfeld, "Self-Disclosure Avoidance: Why I am afraid to tell you who I am," Communication Monographs, 46 (March, 1979), p. 63.

5

Sidney M. Jourard, Self-Disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self (New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1971), p. 2.

- 6 William W. Wilmot, Dyadic Communication: A Transactional Perspective (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1975), pp. 8-12.
- 7 W. Barnett Pearce and Stewart M. Sharp, "Self-Disclosing Communication," Journal of Communication, (1973), pp. 409-425.
- 8 Jourard, p.1.
- 9 Nanette Louise Perry, "A Study of Sex, Interaction, and Attractiveness in Relation to Reported Self-Disclosure," Thesis. Utah State University 1981, p. 1.
- 10 Perry, p.1.
- 11 David W. Johnson, Reaching Out (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 15-39. According to Johnson, self-disclosure is appropriate when: (1) It is not a random or isolated act but rather is part of an ongoing relationship, (2) It is reciprocated, (3) It concerns what is going on within and between persons in the present, (4) It creates a reasonable chance of improving the relationship, (5) Account is taken of the effect it will have upon the other person, (6) It is speeded up in a crisis in the relationship, and (7) it gradually moves to a deeper level.

- 12 Lawrence R. Wheelless and Janis Grotz, "The Measurement of Trust and Its Relationship to Self-Disclosure," Human Communication Research, 3 (1977), pp. 250-257.
- 13 Rosenfeld, p. 63.
- 14 Shirley J. Gilbert and David Horenstein, "The Communication of Self-Disclosure: Level Versus Valence," Human Communication Research, 1 (1975), pp. 316-322.
- 15 Rosenfeld, p. 63.
- 16 Fritz Steele, The Open Organization: The Impact of Secrecy and Disclosure on People and Organizations (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1975).
- 17 Perry, p. 1.
- 18 John Powell, Why Am I Afraid to Tell You Who I Am? (Niles, Illinois: Argus Communications, 1969).
- 19 Perry, p. 2.
- 20 Gerald R. Adams and Sharyn M. Crossman, Physical Attractiveness a cultural imperative. (New York: Libra Publishers, Inc., 1978) pp. 12-43.; R.H. Conviser, "Toward a theory of interpersonal trust," Pacific Sociological Review, 16 (1973),

pp. 377-399.; Sidney M. Jourard and P. Lasakow, "Some factors in self-disclosure," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56 (1958), pp. 91-98; Perry, p.2.

21

Sidney M. Jourard, Disclosing Man to Himself (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1968), p. 23.

22

Teru L. Morton, "Intimacy and reciprocity of exchange: A comparison of spouses and strangers," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36 (1978), pp. 72-81.; Douglas M. Daher and Paul G. Banikiotes, "Interpersonal attraction and rewarding aspects of disclosure content and level," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33 (1976), pp. 492-496.

23

Irwin Altman and Dalmas A. Taylor, Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships (Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), pp. 366-378.

24

Baird, Jr., p. 181.

25

Richard E. Dimond and David C Munz, "Ordinal position of birth and self-disclosure in high-school students," Psychological Reports, 21 (1967), pp. 829-833.

26

Taken from an article published by Eleanor E. Maccoby and Carol N. Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974), pp. 209-210.

27
Perry, p. 33.

28
Gordon J. Chelune, "A Multidimensional Look At Sex
And Target Differences In Disclosure," Psychological Reports,
39 (1976), pp. 259-263.

29
Conviser, pp. 377-399.

30
Jourard, *The Transparent Self*, pp. 51-53.

31
Perry, p. 7.

32
Fred W. Vondracek and Marilyn J. Marshall, "Self-
Disclosure And Interpersonal Trust: An Exploratory Study,"
Psychological Reports, 28 (1971), pp. 235-236.

33
O. Phillip May and Charles L. Thompson, "Perceived Levels
of Self-Disclosure, Mental Health, and Helpfulness of Groups Leaders,"
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, No. 4 (1973), pp. 349-352.;
John H. Berg and Richard L. Archer, "The Disclosure-Liking
Relationship: Effects on Self-Perception, Order of Disclosure,
and Topical Similarity," Human Communication Research, 10, No. 2
(Winter, 1983), pp. 269-281.; Stanley C. Plog, "The Disclosure
of Self in the United States and Germany," The Journal of Social
Psychology, 65 (1965), pp. 193-203.; Perry, p. 39.; Forst,
p. 10.

34 Vondracek and Marshall, p. 235.

35 Vondracek and Marshall, p. 236.

36 Paul C. Cozby, "Self-Disclosure, Reciprocity and Liking," Sociometry, 35, No.1 (1972), pp. 151-160.; Howard J. Ehrlich and David B. Graeven, "Reciprocal Self-Disclosure in a Dyad," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7 (1971), pp. 389-400.

37 Valerian J. Derlega, Marian Sue Harris, and Alan L. Chaikin, "Self-Disclosure Reciprocity, Liking and the Deviant," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9 (1973), pp. 277-284.

38 Richard L. Archer, John H. Berg, Thomas E. Runge, "Active and passive observers' attraction to a self-disclosing other." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16 (1980), pp. 130-145.; Morgan Worthy, Albert L. Gray, and Gay M. Kahn, "Self-Disclosure As An Exchange Process," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, No. 1 (1969), pp. 59-63.; E. Berscheid and E. Walter, Physical Attractiveness: advances in experimental social psychology (New York: Academic Press, 1974), pp. 7-8.; Tand E. Brundage, Valerian J. Derlega and Thomas F. Cash, "The effects of physical attractiveness and need for approval on self-disclosure," PSPB, 3 (1977), pp. 63-66 (Taken from Perry, p. 40.).; Perry, p. 5.

39 Perry, p. 6.

40 Perry, p. 5.

41 Brundage, Derlega, and Cash, pp. 63-66.

42 Alan L. Chaikin and Valerian J. Derlega, Self-Disclosure
(Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1974), p. 27.

43 Taken from article published by Berg and Archer, p. 270.

44 Chaikin and Derlega, p. 27.

45 Archer, Berg, and Runge, pp. 130-145.

46 Taken from article published by Berg and Archer, p. 270.

47 Cozby, pp. 150-154.; Perry, p. 5.

48 Taken from thesis published by Perry, p. 6.; (Andrew W. Harrell
"Physical Attractiveness, self-disclosure, and helping behavior,"
Journal of Social Psychology, 104, No.1 (1978), pp. 15-17.) In the
experiment, female "confederates" asked 216 male subjects for
direction to a health service building. Half of the subjects
received self-disclosure information, while half received no
self-disclosure. In addition, the "confederates" with either
physically attractive or unattractive, evaluated through
attractiveness traits designed by the researcher.

49

Perry, p. 5.

50

Gerald R. Adams and Sharyn M. Crossman. "Physical Attractiveness: a cultural imperative (New York: Libra Publishers, Inc., 1978), pp. 12-43.

51

Thomas E. Runge and Richard L. Archer, "Reactions to the Disclosure of Public and Private Self-Information," Social Psychology Quarterly, 44 (1981), pp. 357-362.; P. Murdoch, R. Chenowith, and K. Rissman, "Eligibility and intimacy effects on self-disclosure." Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Madison, Wisconsin.; Perry, p. 6.

52

Runge and Archer, Public and Private Disclosure, pp. 357-362.

53

Murdoch, Chenowith, and Rissman, paper.

54

Jacquelin W. Gaebeline, "Self-disclosure among friends, acquaintances, and strangers," Psychological Reports, 38, No.3, (1976), pp. 967-970.

55

Robert J. Pellegrini, Robert A. Hicks, Susan Winston-Meyers, and Bruce B. Antal, "Physical attractiveness and self-disclosure in mixed-sex dyads," Psychological Reports, 28, No. 4, (1978), pp. 509-516.; Brundage, Derlega, and Cash, pp. 63-66.; Perry, p.6.

56 Perry, p. 34.

57 Chelune, Multidimensional Look At Sex, pp. 259-263.

58 Adams and Crossman, pp. 12-43.; Conviser, pp. 377-399.;
Jourard and Lasakow, Some factors in self-disclosure, pp. 91-98.

59 The operational definitions for the variable of Intimacy (intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger) were designed by the researcher in conjunction with a questionnaire (Appendix A) completed by students who will participate in the experiment. In January, 1984, students finished a questionnaire that defined the terms intimate friend, acquaintance, and stranger. The researcher combined most frequently answered descriptions into one single definition for each term. The definition of self-disclosure was taken from Jourard's The Transparent Self, p. 1.

60 Taken from Jourard, The Transparent Self, p. 37. Reprinted from an article published by Jourard, "Self-Disclosure in Britain, Puerto Rico, and the United States," Journal of Social Psychology, 54 (1961), pp. 315-320.

61 Taken from Jourard, Self-Disclosure Scores and Grades in Nursing College, p. 244. In this study, the 25-item self-disclosure questionnaire was administered to 46 sophomore students

of the University of Florida College of Nursing during a regular classroom session. Median age of this group was 20 years. By the time this group had become seniors, attrition had reduced the N to 23. Following the completion of the senior academic year, grade-point averages of these 23 subjects were calculated for (a) all nursing courses taken during the 4 years of study, (b) nursing courses taken in the junior and senior years, (c) all nonnursing courses taken during the 4-year program, and (d) all courses combined. Product-moment correlations were calculated between these grade-point averages and the self-disclosure scores obtained 2 years earlier.; In Jourard's article, "Self-Disclosure and other-cathexis," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 59 (1959), pp. 428-431., a self-disclosure questionnaire with 15 items was administered individually to the dean and 8 faculty members of a college of nursing. Subjects were asked to disclose the answers to these questions about themselves to the investigator, and then to indicate to which of their colleagues they had disclosed each item. The subjects were then asked which items of information they knew, from having been told, about from each of their colleagues. Finally, the subjects ordered their colleagues in terms of liking by means of paired comparisons.

62

Reliability and validity measurements were accomplished during the Summer term, 1984, at Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois, 61920. The attractiveness scale was

distributed to students enrolled in the introductory speech communication course. Reliability and validity checks were completed after the experiment was completed by Edmund Forst Jr.

63

Chris B. Geyerman, "The Effects of Dogmatism, Rhetorical Sensitivity, and Position of the Speaker on Selected Speech," Prospectus submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Speech Communication, Eastern Illinois University, 1984.

64

Taken from the SAS User's Guide-"GLM Procedure" (Cary, North Carolina; SAS Institute Inc., 1979); ed. by Jane T. Helwig and Kathryn A. Council, pp. 8-119.

65

Perry, p.33, and Chelune, Repression-Sensitization, pp. 667-670.

66

Conviser, pp. 377-399.

67

Perry, p. 4.

68

Perry, p. 33.

69

Chelune, Multidemsional Look at Sex and Target Differences in Disclosure, p. 259.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Research Project in Self-Disclosure

Defining and explaining terms

Define the following concepts:

1. Intimate friend -

2. Acquaintance -

3. Stranger -

Note - Terms can apply to male or female friends, acquaintances, and strangers.

APPENDIX B

Sex _____

Instructions : On the following pages there are listed a number of items of information about oneself. You are asked to indicate in the special answer blanks the extent to which certain other people know this information about you through your telling it or confiding it to them. If you are certain that the other person knows this information fully-- so that he or she could tell someone else about this aspect of you-- write the number 1 in the appropriate space. If the other person does not know this information fully-- if he or she has only a vague idea, or has an incomplete knowledge of this particular item, write in a zero. Remember, do not write in a 1 unless you are sure that you have given this information to the other person in full enough detail, that they could describe you accurately in this respect to another person.

- ___ 1. What you like to do most in your spare time at home, e.g., read, sports, go out, etc.
- ___ 2. The kind of party or social gathering that you enjoy most.
- ___ 3. Your usual and favorite spare-time reading materials, e.g., novels, non-fiction, science fiction, poetry, etc.
- ___ 4. The kinds of music that you enjoy listening to most, e.g., popular, classical, folk-music, opera.
- ___ 5. The sports you engage in most, if any, e.g., golf, swimming, tennis, baseball, etc.
- ___ 6. Whether or not you know and play any card games, e.g., bridge, poker, gin rummy, etc.
- ___ 7. Whether or not you will drink alcoholic beverages; if so, your favorite drinks-- beer, wine, gin, brandy, whiskey, etc.
- ___ 8. The foods you like best, and the ways you like food prepared; e.g., rare steak, etc.
- ___ 9. Whether or not you belong to any church, if so, which one, and the usual frequency of attending.

- 10. Whether or not you belong to any clubs, fraternity, civic organizations; if so, the names of these organizations.
- 11. Any skills you have mastered, e.g., arts and crafts, painting, sculpture, woodworking, auto repair, knitting, weaving, etc.
- 12. Whether or not you have any favorite spectator sports; if so, what these are, e.g., boxing, wrestling, football, basketball, etc.
- 13. The places that you have travelled to, or lived in during your life--other countries, cities, states.
- 14. What your political sentiments are at present-- your views on state and federal government policies of interest to you.
- 15. Whether or not you have been seriously in love during your life before this year; if so, with whom, what the details were, and the outcome.
- 16. The names of the people in your life whose care and happiness you feel in some way directly responsible for.
- 17. The personal deficiencies that you would most like to improve, or that you are struggling to do something about at present, e.g., appearance, lack of knowledge, loneliness, temper, etc.
- 18. Whether or not you presently owe money; if so, how much, and to whom?
- 19. The kind of future you are aiming toward, working for, planning for-- both personally and vocationally, e.g., marriage and family, professional status, etc.
- 20. Whether or not you are presently involved in any project that you would want to interrupt-- either socially, personally, or in your work; what these projects are.
- 21. The details of your sex life up to the present time, including whether or not you have had, or are now having sexual relations, whether or not you masturbate, etc.
- 22. Your problems and worries about your personality. that is, what you dislike most about yourself, any guilts, inferiority feelings, etc.

- 23. How you feel about the appearance of your body-- your looks, figure, weight-- what you dislike and what you accept in your appearance, and how you wish you might change your looks to improve them.
- 24. Your thoughts about your health, including any problems, worries, or concerns that you might have at present.
- 25. An exact idea of your regular income. (If a student, of your usual combined allowance and earnings, if any.)

State your perceived attractiveness to the target person you have just self-disclosed to. On a scale of 1 to 100, circle the number that represents how attractive this target person is to you. The number 1 represents a very unattractive person while, the number 100 signifies a very attractive person.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44

45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86

87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100